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1 Introduction: What is the case study about?

Focus of the case study
This case study report focuses on the pilot project ‘Landscape is managed together (Landschap onderhouden we samen)’, which is being conducted in the southwestern part of Drenthe (since 2014-2016). In this project local actors manage the landscape in and around their village. This type of management is organized as a bottom-up process: the village inhabitants decide which activities are conducted. They are supported with both practical knowledge on landscape management as well as tools which are provided by a facilitator (the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation, LMD). LMD has broad experience in working together with volunteers in landscape management in the region. The activities of LMD are financed by both local and regional governments.

Spatial scale
The pilot project is being conducted in five municipalities. These are located in the NUTS 3 regions of Southwest Drenthe (whole region) and in North Drenthe (1 municipality) (Fig. 1).

Environmentally and socially beneficial outcome (ESBO)
The aim of the ESBO in the case study is ‘maintaining and enhancing the landscape character’. Benefits of managing the landscape in and around villages by local actors are that their sense of responsibility for the landscape increases and that social cohesion among local people is enhanced. Moreover, the inclusion of farmers in the local groups may both strengthen the understanding of local actors for farmers’ behaviour and activities, and the connection of landscape management on agricultural and non-agricultural land.

Actors and activities that are central for the case study
In the case study three groups of actors can be distinguished:
1. local actors and farmers that live in or close by the village;
2. the regional foundation ‘Landscape Management Drenthe’;
3. local policy makers from five adjacent municipalities (Hoogeveen, Meppel, Midden Drenthe, De Wolden and Westerveld) and regional policy makers of the province of Drenthe.

Central activities in this case study refer to different aspects regarding the management of the landscape in and around the village. They also include facilities like developing hiking paths and constructing pick-nick tables to make the landscape accessible and attractive for recreation.

Main mechanism/government arrangement
It is traditional in Drenthe to recruit people for taking care of the local commons. The so-called ‘boermarke’ institute – which is organized at local level – mobilizes local people for this type of caretaking. Because of this native village inhabitants consider it to be quite a natural process to be involved in landscape management in and around the village in which they live. In many villages in the case study area one or several active local actors mobilized a group of village inhabitants that were willing to manage the local landscape. This group would then decide by means of a bottom-up process which landscape elements they would
deal with and when. Often their practical knowledge of how to maintain the specific landscape aspects is insufficient and technical tools to do so are lacking. In the case study LMD receives subsidy to support the local groups with practical knowledge and tools. LMD has a long tradition of working with volunteers in landscape management and the cooperation with this foundation is highly appreciated by the local groups as LMD is open-minded and easy accessible.
Figure 1 Location of the case study in the Netherlands
2 Definition of the social-ecological system (SES) studied

2.1 Figure of the SES, using the SES Framework
2.2 Short characterisation of key drivers/motivations

Public policy
In 2010 the Province of Drenthe published a new regional vision document in which they announced that landscape management in Drenthe was no longer considered to be a responsibility for the regional government. From then on this had to become the responsibility of the municipalities. In fact this shift meant a reduction of regional expenditure as the Province did not foresee in any subsidies for municipalities to manage the landscape. Five adjacent municipalities in Southwest Drenthe discussed the matter how to face this new situation. They decided to contact the Province of Drenthe in order to explore whether the Province was willing to share the responsibility for landscape management with the municipalities. That lead to the start of a series of meetings with the municipalities and the Province. LMD and the regional Water Board also participated in these meetings. In the end, this resulted in the pilot project ‘Landscape is managed together’ with a budget for both landscape and agricultural nature management. This budget is financed on a 50-50 basis by both the Province Drenthe and the municipalities. The financial means available for agricultural nature management are additional to CAP funding. The pilot project would run from 2013-2015. However, it has been extended to 2016 because working with the local groups turned out to be successful but rather more time consuming than originally expected. This also gives the Province and the municipalities the opportunity to organise future structural financial support for the next 5-6 years to finance landscape management by local people. Given further budget cuts in the field of landscape management, the current view among local and regional policymakers is that it could be promising to connect landscape management by local people with the actual theme of social participation. However, as different policy issues have to compete over restricted budgets, there is no guarantee yet that structural financial support will become available.

Market benefit
Landscape is a public good, for which there is no market. Landscape management by local people is conducted at a voluntarily basis, so locals are not paid for their contribution. Farmers involved in agricultural nature management receive a subsidy, which is a compensation for their costs and income forgone. If one would refer to a market benefit, it could be a negative one, related to missed income by gardeners/contractors who otherwise would have been hired to maintain landscape elements instead of the volunteers performing the work.

Social benefit
Working together in landscape management in and around the village increases social cohesion among local people. Moreover, the feeling of responsibility for the local landscape increases.

Ecological benefit
Periodical landscape management - conducted by volunteers or professionals – maintains or encourages the viability of species which are endangered by quick growing and invasive species.
2.3 Description of other important variables chosen

Social, economic and political settings
The main political driver behind the involvement of local people in landscape management refers to the budget cut on landscape management by the region of Drenthe. This provoked municipalities to find a low costs approach for landscape management at the local level. It was thought that the involvement of local people at a voluntary basis could be a solution for low costs landscape management. Such a choice fits both in the tradition in Southwest Drenthe, where people are used to work as a volunteer in landscape management guided by the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation, and in the tradition of the care of local actors for the commons.

Resource systems
On the whole, landscape management in the pilot project ‘Landscape is managed together’ is restricted to the land in and around the villages in Southwest Drenthe. In fact, the pilot project covers only a part of these properties, as local people decide themselves which landscape elements they will manage, for example, a forest bordering to the village, a nature park within the village, or landscape elements on a barnyard. Often, landscape management activities also include the construction and maintenance of hiking paths, picnic opportunities, playground equipment, birdhouses and information boards. Some parts of the landscape in Southwest Drenthe are in decline or endangered, for example by the oak processionary caterpillar. This last problem can be tackled by trying to increase the population of tits, who eat the caterpillar.

Governance systems
Landscape management by local actors is organized as a bottom-up process, in which a group of local actors takes the initiative (Fig. 2). Government organisations (i.e. the municipalities and the region of Drenthe) work closely together and are operating from a distance: their role is to finance the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation. This is a non-government organization. The other non-government organization involved is the Farmers’ Nature Cooperative, which sometimes mobilizes local actors to initiate a local group for landscape management. However, there are also many local groups where such an incentive by the Farmers’ Nature Cooperative is absent, as the local inhabitants mobilise local groups themselves.

For the actual management of the landscape quite some practical knowledge is needed, for example on the pruning of trees, the proper time for pruning, how to sow trees, the use of plant species if locals want to replant a forest, etc. Moreover, tools are needed for pruning, weeding, planting, etc. Furthermore it appears that locals worry about the costs of a potential accident during the landscape management activities. For all these issues local actors can contact the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation. They have a lot of knowledge on the practical issues concerning landscape management, they provide toolkits to the local

---

1 Sometimes local groups are also active in the cities in Southwest Drenthe. The SES for local groups in villages also applies to them.
groups and they have an accident insurance for volunteers involved in landscape management.

Landscape elements are located on land that is not owned by the local groups. That means that local groups have to interact with the land owners in order to discuss their plans and to ask for permission to carry out the activities. These landowners are usually municipalities or landlords owning large estates. Landscape management at agricultural land is always initiated by farmers, who can decide themselves because they own or rent the land. The willingness and openness of civil servants of municipalities and landlords to the local groups differs: sometimes interaction is quite easy, sometimes interaction is rather tough, which requires a high capacity of local actors to contact and to convince the counterpart.

**Figure 2** Outline of the governance system of landscape management by local actors

*Resource units*

The landscape in and around villages in Southwest Drenthe is the key resource unit in this case study. This landscape includes agricultural land. Depending on property rights of the land, the landscape on agricultural land is managed by farmers whereas the landscape on non-agricultural land is managed by groups of local actors. These groups of local actors may include farmers. This inclusion may both strengthen the understanding of local actors for farmers’ behaviour and activities, and the connection of landscape management on agricultural and non-agricultural land.
Actors
In 2015 there were 125 local groups and 53 individual farmers involved in the pilot project (Table 1). Farmers have a landscape management contract with the municipality. The type of management activities by local groups and farmers hardly differ. Nevertheless, it appears that local groups are – in contrast to farmers – also involved in the management of hiking and biking roads and of archaeological and cultural historical elements. From this the impression arises that the activities of local groups are also directed to non-nature aspects of the landscape. These non-nature aspects support the accessibility and/or the attractiveness of the landscape for human beings.

Table 1 Overview of involved actors and activities in the pilot project ‘Landscape is managed together’ in Southwest Drenthe, 2013-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Landscape management by groups of local actors</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Local groups</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Volunteers</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>2205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management activities by local groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a • Hiking and biking roads</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>10944</td>
<td>54281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b • Forest</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c • Hedgerows, windbreaks, rows of trees, hedges</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d • Trees</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e • Nature areas</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f • Natural borders: roadsides and riverbanks</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g • Pollard trees</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h • Fruit trees</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i • Pools, ponds and other water features</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j • Ditches</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k • Archaeological and cultural historical elements</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Landscape management by farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Contracts</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Participating farmers</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management activities by farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a • Pool and small historic water element</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b • Hedgerows and windbreaks</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>20955</td>
<td>22875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c • Alder coppice singles</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>4750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d • Woodlands and singles</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e • Rows of trees</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>10780</td>
<td>10780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f • Trees</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g • Hedges</td>
<td>meter</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Working Group New Financing of Landscape Drenthe (2016a), Results Pilot Landscape is managed together (Landscape management).
Action situations: Interactions (I) → Outcomes (O)

In this case study, landscape management in and around villages provokes interaction among actors. Local actors and farmers are the core actors, who are supported and facilitated by the Landscape Management Drenthe Foundation, and who have to interact with the landowners on whose land the landscape elements are located (Fig. 2). The outcome refers to a number of landscape elements that have been managed by the local groups and/or farmers, an attractive landscape, strengthening of the social cohesion among local actors, a sense of responsibility for the landscape among local actors, and a better understanding among local actors of the field of forces in which farmers operate.

2.4 Discussion of the SES

In Drenthe there is a long tradition of involvement of local actors at a voluntarily basis in landscape management. This implies that once the regional budget for landscape management was cut, it was a rather obvious step to ask local actors to conduct landscape management activities in order to fill the gap. Most people in Drenthe have an attitude that they are willing to cooperate with each other. So for those local people, who have the capacity to mobilize other local actors, to plan activities and to contact other people for permission, advice etc., it is rather easy to create a group of local actors and to take care of a number of landscape elements in or around the village. The Landscape Management Drenthe Foundation played a role as facilitator and adviser to local groups in case they have questions about ecological and technical details of landscape management and they provided tools. Moreover, they operated as a kind of shop, where local groups could buy local species. The local groups had contacts with the municipality if they needed permission to perform landscape management activities on municipal land. In fact, the whole process can be considered as a bottom-up process, in which the initiative is with the local actors and with municipal and regional policymakers at quite a distance. They only provide funds for the services of the Landscape Management Drenthe Foundation and do not interfere with strict rules in the functioning of the local groups. The cooperation of local actors in landscape management activities increased social cohesion among local actors, increased the attractiveness of the landscape and enlarged local actors’ sense of responsibility for the landscape.

2.5 Common aims, conflicting interests and goals

The common aim of the pilot project is landscape management in and around the villages on agricultural and non-agricultural land. Part of this non-agricultural land is owed by national land management organizations Natuurmonumenten and Staatsbosbeheer. These national land management organizations tend to have a rather formal attitude towards local groups. Therefore local groups avoid landscape management on lands of these organizations. In Southwest Drenthe the share of the land owned by these organizations is rather small.

2.6 Other issues arising from SES analysis and context/case study specific aspects/issues

Not relevant.
3 Status of the SES and potentials

3.1 Description of the SES
See section 2.3 and 2.4.

3.2 Relationships between farming and forestry, and the quantity and quality of ESBOs

There is no direct relationship between landscape management in and around the villages and farming/forestry, apart from landscape management on agricultural land conducted by farmers. However, the cooperation of local actors with farmers in local groups increases the understanding of local actors for the field of forces in which farmers have to operate. In the local groups there is direct contact between local actors and farmers and farmers can explain local actors about the reasons why they have their cows inside the stable or outside in the meadow, the environmental rules they have to comply, the problems with predators eating young farm land birds, etc.

3.3 Key motivational, institutional and socio-economic factors

The actors involved who we have interviewed for this case study (see Chapter 7) put forward a number of enabling factors for successful landscape management by local groups:

a. The presence of one or more active actors who mobilize other local actors
For setting up a local group for landscape management in or around the village, one or more active actors are needed who can mobilize and activate other local actors. Often such actors are already active in other local groups, like the village association, the playground board or the school board. Sometimes such active actors originate from Farmers’ Nature Cooperatives. Due to their involvement in several different groups, these active actors have a broad network inside and outside the village, on which they can build in mobilizing other local actors and interacting with external groups like the municipality and the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation.

b. Creation of local groups needs time
Before local actors really start with landscape management, they should become aware of the need for landscape management in and around the village. Such awareness can be raised by, for example, meetings organized by Farmers’ Nature Cooperatives or village associations. One of the interviewed persons told us that in one village awareness among local actors was provoked by a number of informative meetings on foxes, farm land birds, roes and the processionary caterpillar organized by the Farmers’ Nature Cooperative. The development of awareness among local actors can be considered as a transformation process which takes some time.

c. Landscape management by local actors is organized as a bottom-up process
In order to succeed to involve local actors in landscape management in and around the village, it is essential that local actors have the idea that they can decide themselves which
activities they undertake. This implies that landscape management by local groups asks for a bottom-up process and an administrative structure which stimulates and responds to bottom-up initiatives. It appears that both local and regional policymakers in Drenthe tend to have this required attitude towards bottom-up initiatives. This attitude is enhanced by the close cooperation of local and regional policymakers in Southwest Drenthe towards encouraging landscape management by local groups.

d. **Cooperation of local actors is essential**
Local groups can only be successful if local actors are willing to cooperate with each other. An interviewed person called this: ‘a doing-it-together attitude of the local actors’. Cooperation is usually accompanied by easy communication. In case of quarrels or feuds among local actors it is unlikely that local groups for landscape management will emerge.

e. **An independent external facilitator for supporting local groups**
Knowledge about landscape management is often insufficient among local actors. In the case of Southwest Drenthe the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation plays a role as facilitator and supporter for the local groups. This foundation has a long experience of working with volunteers in landscape management and is trusted by the local actors. The foundation facilitates and supports local groups by providing them knowledge about the landscape and landscape elements which changes local actors’ perception of the landscape, helping them to develop landscape management plans for their village, teaching them how to manage landscape elements, providing tools and planting materials, organizing courses how to handle a chainsaw, etc. This facilitator has to be paid for its services. In the case of the pilot study in Southwest Drenthe local and regional governments funded the facilitator directly (Fig. 2.2). In some municipalities in Southwest Drenthe it appeared that sometimes municipal services also play a role as facilitator. This is only effective if these municipal services are trusted by the local actors.

f. **Use a territorial plan**
Many local actors live in the village because it is a pleasant place to live with an attractive landscape. So it is likely that local actors are eager to take care of managing landscape elements in or around the village as they enjoy these landscape elements on a daily basis. The local group makes a plan for the territory (i.e. the village and its surroundings) with an overview of the particular landscape elements that will be managed and a time schedule when these specific activities will be conducted. It is important that local actors manage those landscape elements which are significant for their landscape experience. A time schedule is useful because local actors like to know that an activity is not too time-consuming. In such a territorial plan other issues can also be integrated, for example, the construction of biking or hiking paths or picnic tables, cooperation with schools on the construction of bird houses, organizing of activities with other groups in the village etc.
This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 633814
3.4 Levels of provision, trends and determinants

Quantitative information
The ESBO in this case study refers to maintaining and enhancing the landscape character. Table 1 provides quantitative information on landscape elements managed by the local groups and farmers in the scope of the pilot project ‘Landscape is managed together’ during 2013-2015.

Judgement of social aspects
Main social aspects of landscape management by local actors refer to the increase in social cohesion among local people and their feeling of responsibility for the local landscape. Moreover, the cooperation of local actors with farmers in local groups increases the understanding of local actors for the field of forces in which farmers have to operate.

Often links are created between the local group involved in landscape management and other groups in the village. This could refer to a cooperation with the local primary school. For example, a local group wanted to encourage the tits population in order to beat the oak processionary caterpillar. They approached the local school with the request if school children could make bird houses for tits. Such an activity is a nature experience for both children and their parents, according to one of the interviewed persons: ‘The school children first constructed the bird houses and decorated them. Then they hung them in the trees. We could teach the children then that the opening of the bird houses has to be on the northern side. Afterwards children often made their parents go back with them to see if the birds had already nested in their particular bird house. In the autumn we clean the bird houses together with the children.’ In another village the local group involved in landscape management was integrated in a whole web of other local groups. Together they constructed a ‘play forest’, for which they managed to raise funds from various sources. They used these funds among others to construct information boards in braille for the residents of the adjacent shelter for visually impaired, maps for a discovery tour and nets for fishing and catching butterflies. These items are sold at the nearby information centre. This play forest attracts both people from the village and people from other villages, for example to celebrate a child’s birthday party or to enjoy a picnic. The local catering entrepreneurs also benefit from these visitors.

Appreciation: ‘managing the landscape together is nice and results in satisfaction’
The appreciation of landscape management by local groups was assessed by the interviewed persons as follows:

‘It is nice to work together so that the village becomes more attractive.’
‘You enjoy the results of the landscape management by local groups every day. This is attractive as we all want to live in a beautiful surrounding.’
‘If you think your village is important, then it is natural that you also participate in landscape management. Due to the activities by the local group the landscape looks cleaner, which in its turn provokes more decent behaviour of people.’
‘The feeling that you do something for your village and its surroundings: after one day of hard work together you have a nice field margin, hedge or picnic table. Afterwards it is rewarding to see the picnic table being used regularly by people. Then you realize that your efforts paid off.’
The interviewees also emphasized that ‘volunteer work on landscape management has to be cosy and fun. For example, start with a cup of coffee and end with lunch, soup or a drink.’

Limiting factor: not all landscape elements can be managed by local groups
‘Working together on managing landscape elements is fun and it satisfies’ according to one of the interviewed persons. However, it cannot be expected that local groups manage hedgerows km after km. Moreover, for certain management activities highly specialized machines are needed. In such cases, there is still a task for the municipality services. In addition, the quality of the landscape management by local actors is not guaranteed nor the continuation of the local groups in the longer run.

3.5 Relevant governance arrangements and institutional frameworks
See section 2.3.

3.6 Other context/case study specific aspects/issues
To ensure that local groups can continue with managing the landscape and around the village once the pilot project finishes, structural funding is needed for the facilitator. Therefore local and regional policymakers are currently exploring which funds could be appointed for structural financial means. Given further budget cuts in Dutch nature policy, one hopes that linking landscape management by local groups with the actual policy dossier of citizens’ participation might provide an opportunity.
4 Conclusions derived from analysis in Steps 1 and 2

4.1 Key findings on the particular SES and its potentials

Relationships between farming and the quality of ESBO
There is no direct relationship between landscape management in and around the villages and farming/forestry, apart from landscape management on agricultural land conducted by farmers. However, the cooperation of local actors with farmers in local groups increases the understanding of local actors for the field of forces in which farmers have to operate. In the local groups there is a direct contact between local actors and farmers and farmers can explain local actors about the reasons why they have their cows inside the stable or outside in the meadow, the environmental rules they have to comply, the problems with predators eating young farm land birds, etc.

Appreciation and demand side of ESBO provision
The main beneficiaries of landscape management in and around the village by local actors are the local actors themselves, as it enhances the attractiveness of the landscape in and around the village. For many local actors, this landscape is a main reason why they live in the particular village. Of course, landscape is a public good and as such also other people – mainly tourists – may enjoy the benefits of the landscape managed by local actors. However, it has to be noted that ‘the weather is a more important factor for attracting tourists than a beautiful landscape’ according to a remark of one of the interviewees.

Increase in the awareness and provision of ESBO
Not relevant.

4.2 Governance arrangements and institutional frameworks

Enabling factors
In Southwest Drenthe landscape elements in and around villages are managed by groups of local actors and farmers. The following factors could be put forward to enhance the organization and functioning of these local groups (see section 3.3):

a. the presence of one or more active actors who mobilize other local actors;
b. patience: the creation and organization of local groups takes time;
c. landscape management by local actors is organized as a bottom-up process;
d. cooperation of local actors is essential; quarrels or feuds are disastrous;
e. an independent external facilitator is needed to support local groups;
f. use a territorial plan for the selection of which landscape elements will be managed.

Strengths and weaknesses of landscape management by local actors

Strengths:
- increase in social cohesion among local people;
- enforcement of the sense of responsibility by local actors for their local landscape;
- cooperation of local actors with farmers in local groups increases the understanding of local actors for the field of forces in which farmers have to operate.
Weaknesses:

- There is no guarantee on the quality of the landscape management by local actors;
- There is no guarantee on the continuation of the local groups in the longer run;
- Not all landscape elements can be managed by local groups: it cannot be expected that local groups manage hedgerows km after km and for certain management activities highly specialized machines are needed which usually requires action from the municipality.

The weakness of a low quality of landscape management by local actors can be addressed by teaching local actors how to manage the landscape elements e.g. to sow benches etc. at the right place and the right time, or by providing them with the right tools. A facilitator like the LMD foundation can support local actors in these matters. The other two weaknesses are inherent to working with volunteers.

**Role of local and regional policymakers**

In this case study of landscape management by local actors in Southwest Drenthe only local and regional policymakers were involved. Their attitude towards the bottom-up process of landscape management by local groups can be called constructive: they stimulated and responded to these initiatives by providing the local groups the room of manoeuvre they needed.

4.3 **Other enabling or limiting factors**

See section 4.2.

4.4 **Reflections on the case study methodology used and potential improvements**

The approach to the case study was as follows:

1. We contacted the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation for written background material and for stakeholders we could interview;
2. We had 7 face-to-face interviews with open questions with: 2 members of 2 different local groups, with 2 farmers, with employees of the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation, with a regional policy maker and a local policymaker;
3. Based on the background material and the information collected during the interviews we drafted the case study report;
4. The draft case study report was presented at a regular meeting of the province, 5 municipalities and the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation. The discussion during the presentation resulted in some minor adjustments of the draft case study report.

The applied approach is quite common in this type of case studies and worked well.

5 **Research and action mandate for Steps 3 and 4**

Until now, no agreements for following steps in this case study have been made.
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7 ANNEX

7.1 Documentation of research and action progress

Interviewed persons (April 19-21, 2016)
- 2 members of 2 different local groups;
- 2 farmers;
- 2 employees of the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation;
- 1 regional policy maker;
- 1 local policymaker.

Presentation and discussion of the draft case study report at a regular meeting of province, 5 municipalities and the Landscape Management Drenthe foundation in Meppel at June 16, 2016. Participants of this meeting were:
- Iris Zwartkruis (municipality of Midden Drenthe);
- Robert Koetschruiter (municipality of Hoogeveen);
- Carolien van de Bles (municipality of Meppel);
- Robert Kalkhuis (municipality of Westerveld);
- Sibert Hoeksma (Landscape Management Drenthe foundation);
- Erik de Gruijter (Landscape Management Drenthe foundation);
- Marije Kattenwinkel (province of Drenthe);
- Bertho Bulthuis (Water Board Reest and Wieden);
- Rene Vree Egberts (Agricultural Nature Cooperative Drenthe).

7.2 Supporting data and statistics

Working Group New Financing of Landscape Drenthe (2016), Results Pilot Landscape is managed together (Landscape management).